Case 2:10-cv-00072-J-BB Document 3 Filed 04/20/10 Page 1 of 2 Page D

APRIL 20, 2010

KAREN S. MITCHELL
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS AMARILLO DIVISION

ADRIAN MAURICE THOMAS,	§	
	§	
Petitioner,	§	
	§	
V.	§	2:10-CV-0072
	§	
RICK THALER, Director,	§	
Texas Department of Criminal Justice,	§	
Correctional Institutions Division,	§	
	§	
Respondent.	§	

# REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO DENY PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS BY A PERSON IN STATE CUSTODY

Petitioner has filed with this Court a Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody challenging the result of a prison disciplinary proceeding. In order to challenge a state prison disciplinary adjudication by way of a federal petition for a writ of habeas corpus, a petitioner MUST, at a minimum, be eligible for release on mandatory supervision AND have received a punishment sanction that included forfeiture of previously accrued good time credits. See Malchi v. Thaler, 211 F.3d 953, 958 (5th Cir. 2000). In his habeas application, petitioner acknowledges he did not lose any previously earned good time credits as a result of the disciplinary proceeding herein challenged. See Question 18. As the law in the Fifth Circuit currently stands, petitioner did not receive a punishment sanction that included forfeiture of previously accrued good time credits and, thus, is not entitled to federal habeas corpus relief. Petitioner's habeas application should be DENIED.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is the RECOMMENDATION of the United States Magistrate Judge to the United States District Judge that the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody filed by petitioner be DENIED.

#### **INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE**

The United States District Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Report and Recommendation to each party by the most efficient means available.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

ENTERED this 20th day of April 2010.

CLINTON E. AVERITTE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Quille

### \* NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT \*

Any party may object to these proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation. In the event parties wish to object, they are hereby NOTIFIED that the deadline for filing objections is fourteen (14) days from the date of filing as indicated by the "entered" date directly above the signature line. Service is complete upon mailing, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C), or transmission by electronic means, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(E). **Any objections must be filed on or before the fourteenth (14th) day after this recommendation is filed** as indicated by the "entered" date. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d).

Any such objections shall be made in a written pleading entitled "Objections to the Report and Recommendation." Objecting parties shall file the written objections with the United States District Clerk and serve a copy of such objections on all other parties. A party's failure to timely file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation contained in this report shall bar an aggrieved party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings, legal conclusions, and recommendation set forth by the Magistrate Judge in this report and accepted by the district court. *See Douglass v. United Services Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996); *Rodriguez v. Bowen*, 857 F.2d 275, 276-77 (5th Cir. 1988).